

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 have been again rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidson, U.S. Patent No. 4,873,717 in view of Foster, U.S. Patent No. 4,757,526. The rejection is traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Davidson teaches the claimed features but does not teach or suggest a Centrex group. The Examiner relies on Foster as teaching this feature and asserts that it would have been obvious to have modified Davidson in view of

With reference to Davison at col. 13, lines 1-6 and col. 9, lines 4-6, the reference fails to disclose switching of a connection for the transmission of signaling information and useful information, e.g. voice data. Rather, Davidson discloses an internal control message that contains information about the call, including the calling number and a call type field, such as an outgoing call external, outgoing call external, incoming call external, and incoming call internal (col. 13, lines 1-6). Additionally, the reference relates to internal data structures and internal processes. In the example, block DISPD601 contains the calling directory number and the calling party's name. Process TTP2 also has a process control block, PCBLA701, in which process TTP2 stores data about a call. Hence, there is no disclosure of switching in system 100.

The reference also fails to disclose setting up only a connection for the transmission of pure signaling information...between the calling subscriber terminal and the at least one further subscriber terminal of the group, as required by the amended claims. Call forwarding requires a connection for useful information, e.g. voice data. Therefore, call forwarding is contrary to the claimed invention in which only a connection for the transmission of pure signaling information is created to the further terminal, i.e. no connection for transmitting useful information. Additionally, the reference fails to disclose setting up **only a connection** for the transmission of pure signaling information but **not** for transmitting useful information. The switching connection is Davidson, in fact, is not disclosed in detail. Rather, the reference uses ISDN in which it is always possible to have a connection (D-channel) for transmitting signaling information and a connection (B-channel) for transmitting useful information at the same time. This is evidenced by the fact that

Davidson discloses ISDN messages that are used together with a useful connection, i.e. a connection for transmitting voice data (see, SETUP, INFO ALTERING).

Foster relates to Centrex services provided to subscribers having a main location connected to one local exchange and a remote or satellite location connected to another local exchange (col. 1, lines 11-14). Incoming calls from the outside come in via the main location exchange (col. 1, lines 14-16). Davidson, on the other hand, relates to a call coverage arrangement in which coverage personnel are informed of the switch-hook status of covered terminals by way of a single two-part indicator on the coverage terminal (abstract). Applicants submit that there would have been no reason for one to modify Davidson to provide a Centrex group. Doing so would not add anything to the system disclosed in Davidson. "The totality of the prior art must be considered, and proceeding contrary to accepted wisdom in the art is evidence of nonobviousness." MPEP 2145 (citing *In re Hedges*, 783 F.2d 1038, 1041 (Fed. Cir. 1986), 228 USPQ 685; "Known disadvantages in old device which would naturally discourage search for new inventions may be taken into account in determining obviousness." MPEP 2145 (citing *United States v. Adams*, 383 US 39, 52, 148 USPQ 479, 484 (1966)); "Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle. When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill in the art has good reason to pursue the know options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense." *KSR Intern. Co.*, 127 S.Ct. at 1740.

Further, the Examiner has not pointed to any specific evidence of record which supports the stated motivation to combine these references. Merely stating that Centrex has advantages, such as broadening user communication access and distribution quickly and cost effectively, without owning and maintaining a private network, does not address any of the problems sought to be addressed in Davidson. Davidson is only concerned with the switch-hook status of covered terminals. Further, Davidson is not concerned with the way in which calls are routed to remote locations (as in Foster), but rather whether it is appropriate to route calls at all,

thus the switch-hook status information. The switch-hook aspect is essential to the invention, and without it does not operate (see, for example, the abstract). Additionally, the specification clearly notes that recognized deficiencies of the prior art include inefficient call handling afforded by call coverage arrangements that fail to inform coverage personnel of the switch-hook status of covered multiple call appearance terminals (see, for example, col. 2, lns. 31-40). Thus, it is clear that Davidson seeks to solve the long recognized deficiency in the prior art of failing to inform personnel of switch-hook status. Applicants therefore submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Davidson in view of Foster to create the claimed invention. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Office is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket no. (118744-193) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Kevin R. Spivak
Reg. No. 43,148
Customer No. 29177

Dated: November 24, 2008